

Lloyd T. Findley

*CIAD-Unidad Guaymas, Guaymas, Sonora, Mexico*

Carter R. Gilbert

*University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, U.S.A.*

Robert N. Lea

*California Fish and Game, Monterey, California, U.S.A.*

Nicholas E. Mandrak

*Great Lakes Laboratory for Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, Burlington, Ontario, Canada*

James D. Williams

*United States Geological Survey, Gainesville, Florida, U.S.A.*

We, members of the Committee on Names of Fishes, a joint committee of the American Fisheries Society and the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, support the proposal by Collette & Parin that the Commission use its plenary power and reinstate the specific name of *Sphyræna acus* Lacepède, 1803. We believe that the petitioners make an excellent case for this action. In our various editions of *Common and scientific names of fishes . . .*, our committee used the specific name as *Strongylura acus* in 1960 and as *Tylosurus acus* in 1970, 1980, 1991 and 2004. During the preparation of the 2004 edition (Nelson et al., 2004), we were prepared to follow Opinion 900 and accept the suppression of the name *Tylosurus acus* (Lacepède, 1803) and use *Tylosurus imperialis* (Rafinesque, 1810). However, given analyses that almost all authors, both in systematic and non-systematic literature, continue to use the specific name *acus*, as earlier advocated by Collette & Berry, 1965 (p. 391) and with which we agree, we continued to use *acus*. Present usage is compatible with the fact that the type locality for the oldest available name, *T. acus*, is the West Indies, while that for *T. imperialis* is the Mediterranean Sea. Amending the ruling in Opinion 900 (1) and placing the name *acus*, as published in the binomen *Sphyræna acus* Lacepède, 1803, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology as proposed in BZN 62: 234 will have the greatest stabilizing effect.

#### **Comment on the proposed conservation of *Palamopus* E. Hitchcock, 1845**

**(Ichnotaxa, Reptilia?)**

(Case 3348; see BZN 62: 237–239)

Spencer G. Lucas

*New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science, 1801 Mountain Road NW, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87104–1375, U.S.A.*

I support Emma Rainforth's (BZN 62: 237–239) application to conserve *Palamopus* Hitchcock, 1845 and suppress its senior objective synonym *Sauroidichnites* Hitchcock, 1837. I base my support of her application on the following

considerations: *Sauroidichnites* Hitchcock, 1837 is the senior objective synonym of *Palamopus* Hitchcock, 1845 but has not been used as a valid name after 1899, so it is a nomen oblitum; *Palamopus* Hitchcock, 1845 has been used since 1899, though not in a sufficient number of works by enough authors during the last 50 years to satisfy the conditions of Article 23.9.1.2. Nevertheless, all of the usage since 1845 has been of the name *Palamopus*. Furthermore, most workers have considered Lull (1953) to be the standard work on Connecticut Valley tracks, and Lull used *Palamopus*. Haubold (1971), in another standard compendium, also used *Palamopus*.

Rainforth (2005, pp. 356–361) reviewed in detail the tortured ichnotaxonomic history of *Palamopus* and also reviewed (pp. 436–439) the even more tortured history of *Sauroidichnites*. These reviews demonstrate that *Sauroidichnites* is the more problematical name. Thus, for example, *Ornithichnites palmatus* is the type species of *Sauroidichnites*, but most authors have erroneously considered its type species to be *S. barrattii*, which is a nomen nudum. The name *Sauroidichnites* reflects Hitchcock's early philosophy in naming the Connecticut Valley footprints he studied. He thought that these footprints represented three classes of vertebrates (amphibians, reptiles and birds) and coined an ichnogenetic name for each class: *Batrachoidichnites*, *Sauroidichnites* and *Ornithoidichnites*, respectively. Each broadly construed ichnogenus encompassed many ichnospecies. In 1845, Hitchcock abandoned that philosophy and coined new ichnogenetic names more similar to the kinds of ichnogenetic names coined since. *Palamopus* Hitchcock, 1845, with one ichnospecies, is such a name. Most significantly, in 1845 Hitchcock abandoned his own name *Sauroidichnites* and did not use it again.

In summary, the confused ichnotaxonomic name *Sauroidichnites* was based on an antiquated and long abandoned philosophy of ichnotaxonomy. The original author of *Sauroidichnites* abandoned it in 1845 and it has not been used since. *Palamopus* is a less confused ichnotaxonomic name and all 20th century usage has been of *Palamopus*. Therefore, it makes sense to suppress *Sauroidichnites* and conserve the name *Palamopus*.